UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,852	12/11/2000	Hyun-Jeong Kim	678-0578	4736

66547 7590 05/09/2011

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
290 Broadhollow Road
Suite 210E
Melville, NY 11747

EXAMINER	
LY, NGHI H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/09/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/734,852	KIM, HYUN-JEONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NGHI H. LY	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 February 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *16-22 and 24-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *16-22 and 24-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16-19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Choksi et al (US 6,477,243) and Lele et al (US 6,185,433).

Regarding claim 16, John teaches a method of communication a confirmation message (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), comprising the steps of: informing a called mobile station of receipt of a message from a calling station (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), determining, when the received message is a text message (column 1, lines 34-55, see “electronic mail” and it reads on Applicant’s “text message”), which is stores in the called mobile station (se column 1, lines 22-23), and transmitting (see Abstract, column 4, lines 41-49 and column 7, lines 39-44), a confirmation message to be delivered to the calling station (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), wherein the confirmation message is generated when the called mobile station has confirmed the received message (see Abstract, column 5, lines 33-36, column 6, lines 30-40 and column 7, lines 39-45).

John does not specifically disclose transmitting, from the called mobile station, a confirmation message to be delivered to the calling mobile station, wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called mobile station when the user of the called mobile station has confirmed the received message.

Itoh teaches transmitting, from the called mobile station, a confirmation message to be delivered to the calling mobile station (see column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*"), wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called mobile station when the user of the called mobile station has confirmed the received message (also see column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Itoh into the system of John in order to reduce the burden at the base station.

The combination of John and Itoh does not specifically disclose whether a called party of the called station has read the received message, wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called station when the called party of the called station

has read the received message, and wherein the confirmation message includes a telephone number of the calling station.

Choksi teaches whether a called party of the called station has read the received message (see Abstract, column 1, lines 22-27, column 6, lines 6-11 and column 7, lines 36-41, see "***has been read***", "***has actually read***"), wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called station when the called party of the called station has read the received message (see Abstract, column 1, lines 22-27, column 6, lines 6-11 and column 7, lines 36-41, see "***has been read***", "***has actually read***" and "***the message has read, reviewed, or otherwise accessed the message***"), and wherein the confirmation message includes a telephone number of the calling station (see column 9, lines 43-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Choksi into the system of John and Itoh so that a notification can be received by a particular user.

The combination of John, Itoh and Choksi does not specifically disclose from the called mobile station, a message directly to the calling mobile station.

Lele teaches from the called mobile station, a message directly to the calling mobile station (see column 7, lines 35-44, see "*The data message may be transmitted to the calling communication device either* ***directly*** *(e.g., when the two communication devices are in so-called* ***talkaround mode****)*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Lele into the system of

John, Itoh and Choksi in order to inform a user of the calling device of the busy status of the called device without disrupting the user of the called device (see Lele, Abstract).

Regarding claim 17, John further teaches the step of determining, if the received message is a voice message (see column 6, lines 30-41 and see column 7, lines 39-45), whether the called mobile station is connected to a voice mail center in order to confirm the received voice message (see Abstract).

Regarding claim 18, John further teaches the confirmation message is a data burst message (see column 5, lines 10-35, "play", "delete", "played" and "unplayed" and see column 7, lines 39-45 and column 6, lines 34-36).

Regarding claim 19, John further teaches the confirmation message is a short message (see column 5, lines 10-35, "play", "delete", "played" and "unplayed").

Regarding claim 28, the combination of John, Itoh, Choksi and Lele further teaches determining whether a confirmation key of a key input part to confirm the received message is pushed by the user of the called mobile station (see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***' reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*", and see Choksi, column 6, lines 25-28, see "clicking on a send confirmation button").

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Choksi et al (US

6,477,243) and Lele et al (US 6,185,433) and further in view of DeGiorgio et al (US 3,866,206).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of John, Itoh, Choksi and Lele teaches displaying, in the calling mobile station (see John, column 7, lines 39-45, see "displaying alphanumeric message", and see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*"), information indicating receipt of the confirmation message, upon receipt of the confirmation message (see John, column 7, lines 39-45, see "displaying alphanumeric message", and see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*").

The combination of John, Itoh, Choksi and Lele does not specifically disclose sounding an alarm upon receipt of the confirmation message.

DeGiorgio teaches sounding an alarm upon receipt of the confirmation message (see column 9, lines 64-68 and see fig.5, beeper 156).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of DeGiorgio into the

system of John, Itoh, Choksi and Lele so that the sender can response to the alarm faster.

4. Claims 16-19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Goldberg et al (US 6,304,636), Choksi et al (US 6,477,243) and Lele et al (US 6,185,433).

Regarding claim 16, John teaches a method of communication a confirmation message (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), comprising the steps of: informing a called mobile station of receipt of a message from a calling station (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), determining, when the received message is a text message (column 1, lines 34-55, see "electronic mail" and it reads on Applicant's "text message"), which is stores in the called mobile station (se column 1, lines 22-23), and transmitting (see Abstract, column 4, lines 41-49 and column 7, lines 39-44), a confirmation message to be delivered to the calling station (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), wherein the confirmation message is generated when the called mobile station has confirmed the received message (see Abstract, column 5, lines 33-36, column 6, lines 30-40 and column 7, lines 39-45).

John does not specifically disclose transmitting, from the called mobile station, a confirmation message to be delivered to the calling mobile station, wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called mobile station when the user of the called mobile station has confirmed the received message.

Itoh teaches transmitting, from the called mobile station, a confirmation message to be delivered to the calling mobile station (see column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an **answer signal** to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*"), wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called mobile station when the user of the called mobile station has confirmed the received message (also see column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an **answer signal** to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Itoh into the system of John in order to reduce the burden at the base station.

The combination of John and Itoh does not specifically disclose whether a called party of the called station has read the received message, wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called station when the called party of the called station has read the received message.

Goldberg teaches whether a called party of the called station has read the received message, wherein the confirmation message is generated by the called station when the called party of the called station has read the received message (see column

1, lines 12-20, "*cellular phone*", column 3, lines 28-49, see "*can be listened*", "*can be* ***read***", and see "***retrieves*** *or* ***opens***" or "***has opened***" and it reads on applicant's "*has read*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Goldberg into the system of John and Itoh in order to convert the voice message to a digital file and sending an electronic mail message that includes the digital file to the called party (see Goldberg, Abstract).

The combination of John, Itoh and Goldberg does not specifically disclose wherein the confirmation message includes a telephone number of the calling station.

Choksi teaches wherein the confirmation message includes a telephone number of the calling station (see column 9, lines 43-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Choksi into the system of John, Itoh and Goldberg so that a notification can be received by a particular user.

The combination of John, Itoh, Goldberg and Choksi does not specifically disclose from the called mobile station, a message directly to the calling mobile station.

Lele teaches from the called mobile station, a message directly to the calling mobile station (see column 35-44, see "*The data message may be transmitted to the calling communication device either* ***directly*** *(e.g., when the two communication devices are in so-called* ***talkaround mode****)*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Lele into the system of John, Itoh, Goldberg and Choksi in order to inform a user of the calling device of the busy status of the called device without disrupting the user of the called device (see Lele, Abstract).

Regarding claim 17, the combination of John, Itoh, Goldberg, Choksi and Lele further teaches the step of determining, if the received message is a voice message (see John, column 6, lines 30-41 and see column 7, lines 39-45), whether the called mobile station is connected to a voice mail center in order to confirm the received voice message (see John, Abstract and see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***' reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*").

Regarding claim 18, John further teaches the confirmation message is a data burst message (see column 5, lines 10-35, "play", "delete", "played" and "unplayed" and see column 7, lines 39-45 and column 6, lines 34-36).

Regarding claim 19, John further teaches the confirmation message is a short message (see column 5, lines 10-35, "play", "delete", "played" and "unplayed").

Regarding claim 28, the combination of John, Itoh, Goldberg, Choksi and Lele further teaches determining whether a confirmation key of a key input part to confirm the received message is pushed by the user of the called mobile station (see Itoh, column

5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*", and see Choksi, column 6, lines 25-28, see "clicking on a send confirmation button").

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Goldberg et al (US 6,304,636), Choksi et al (US 6,477,243) and Lele et al (US 6,185,433) and further in view of DeGiorgio et al (US 3,866,206).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of John, Itoh, Goldberg, Choksi and Lele teaches displaying, in the calling mobile station (see John, column 7, lines 39-45, see "displaying alphanumeric message", and see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*"), information indicating receipt of the confirmation message, upon receipt of the confirmation message (see John, column 7, lines 39-45, see "displaying alphanumeric message", and see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an* ***answer signal*** *to the calling party via the base station, and the calling*

party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*").

The combination of John, Itoh, Goldberg, Choksi and Lele does not specifically disclose sounding an alarm upon receipt of the confirmation message.

DeGiorgio teaches sounding an alarm upon receipt of the confirmation message (see column 9, lines 64-68 and see fig.5, beeper 156).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of DeGiorgio into the system of John, Itoh, Goldberg, Choksi and Lele so that the sender can response to the alarm faster.

6. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Lele et al (US 6,185,433) and Goldberg et al (US 6,304,636).

Regarding claim 21, John teaches a method of communicating a confirmation message (see Abstract, see column 4, lines 41-49 and see column 7, lines 39-44), comprising the steps of: determining by a called mobile station, when a voice call is not normally established between a called mobile station and a calling station (see column 3, lines 8-9, "If calling party tries to call the mobile subscriber when not available"), whether a user of the called mobile station has confirmed a message, wherein the message is created and transmitted by the calling station (see Abstract, column 5, lines 33-36, column 6, lines 30-40 and column 7, lines 39-45), generating, a confirmation

message indicating the confirmation (see Abstract, column 5, lines 33-36, column 6, lines 30-40 and column 7, lines 39-45), and transmitting, the confirmation message to the calling station (see Abstract, column 5, lines 33-36, column 6, lines 30-40 and column 7, lines 39-45).

John does not specifically disclose generating, by the called mobile station, a confirmation message indicating the confirmation by the user, and transmitting, from the called mobile station, the confirmation message to the calling mobile station.

Itoh teaches disclose generating, by the called mobile station, a confirmation message indicating the confirmation by the user (see column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an **answer signal** to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*"), and transmitting, from the called mobile station, the confirmation message to the calling mobile station (also see column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an **answer signal** to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Itoh into the system of John in order to reduce the burden at the base station.

The combination of John and Itoh does not specifically disclose from the called mobile station, the message directly to the calling mobile station.

Lele teaches from the called mobile station, the message directly to the calling mobile station (see column 35-44, see "*The data message may be transmitted to the calling communication device either **directly** (e.g., when the two communication devices are in so-called **talkaround mode**)*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Lele into the system of John and Itoh in order to inform a user of the calling device of the busy status of the called device without disrupting the user of the called device (see Lele, Abstract).

The combination of John, Itoh and Lele does not specifically disclose whether called party of the called station has played back a message, wherein the message is created and transmitted by the calling station, generating, by the called station, a confirmation message when the called party of the called station has played back the message.

Goldberg teaches whether called party of the called station has played back a message, wherein the message is created and transmitted by the calling station, generating, by the called station, a confirmation message when the called party of the called station has played back the message (see column 1, lines 12-20, "*cellular phone*", column 3, lines 28-49, see "*can be listened*", "*can be **read***", and see "***retrieves** or **opens***" or "***has opened***" and it reads on applicant's "*played back*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Goldberg into the system of John, Itoh and Lele in order to convert the voice message to a digital file and sending an electronic mail message that includes the digital file to the called party (see Goldberg, Abstract).

Regarding claim 22, John further teaches the message is a voice message (see Abstract).

Regarding claim 23, the combination of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg further teaches the message transmitted by the calling mobile station is a text message (see Lele, column 35-44, see "*The data message may be transmitted to the calling communication device either **directly** (e.g., when the two communication devices are in so-called **talkaround mode**)*", and see John, column 1, lines 34-55, see "electronic mail" and it reads on Applicant's "text message").

Regarding claim 24, John further teaches the confirmation message is a data burst message (see column 5, lines 10-35, "play", "delete", "played" and "unplayed" and see column 7, lines 39-45 and column 6, lines 34-36).

Regarding claim 25, John further teaches the confirmation message is a short message (see column 5, lines 10-35, "play", "delete", "played" and "unplayed").

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further Lele et al (US 6,185,433), Goldberg et al (US 6,304,636) and DeGiorgio et al (US 3,866,206).

Regarding claim 26, the combination of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg teaches displaying, in the calling mobile station (see John, column 7, lines 39-45, see "displaying alphanumeric message", and see Lele, column 35-44, see "*The data message may be transmitted to the calling communication device either **directly** (e.g., when the two communication devices are in so-called **talkaround mode**)*"), information indicating receipt of the confirmation message, upon receipt of the confirmation message (also see John, column 7, lines 39-45, see "displaying alphanumeric message").

The combination of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg does not specifically disclose sounding an alarm upon receipt of the confirmation message.

DeGiorgio teaches sounding an alarm upon receipt of the confirmation message (see column 9, lines 64-68 and see fig.5, beeper 156).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of DeGiorgio into the system of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg so that the sender can respond to the alarm faster.

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Lele et al (US 6,185,433), Goldberg et al (US 6,304,636) and Choksi et al (US 6,477,243).

Regarding claim 27, John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg teaches claim 21. The combination of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg does not specifically disclose the confirmation message includes a telephone number of the calling mobile station.

Choksi teaches the confirmation message includes a telephone number of the calling mobile station (see Choksi, column 9, lines 43-55, and see Lele, column 35-44, see "*The data message may be transmitted to the calling communication device either **directly** (e.g., when the two communication devices are in so-called **talkaround mode***").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Choksi into the system of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg so that a notification can be received by a particular user.

9. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John (US 6,216,106) in view of Itoh (US 5,280,521) and further in view of Lele et al (US 6,185,433), Goldberg et al (US 6,304,636) and Choksi et al (US 6,477,243).

Regarding claim 29, the combination of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg teaches a confirmation to confirm the message by the user of the called mobile station (see Itoh, column 5, lines 2-6, see "*The called mobile station verifies that it has received the message correctly, and then sends an **answer signal** to the calling party via the base station, and the calling party verifies that the message has reached the called mobile station*". In this case, Itoh's "***answer signal***" reads on applicant' "*a confirmation message*"). The combination John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg does not specifically disclose determining whether a confirmation key of a key input part to confirm the message is pushed by the user of the called station.

Choksi teaches determining whether a confirmation key of a key input part to confirm the message is pushed by the user of the called station (see Choksi, column 6, lines 25-28, see "clicking on a send confirmation button")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Choksi into the system of John, Itoh, Lele and Goldberg so that a notification can be received by a particular user.

Response to Arguments

10. **a**. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-22 and 24-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

b. Applicant's arguments filed 02/22/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Choksi and/or newly cited Goldberg indeed teaches the amended claims. In addition, applicant's attention is directed to the teaching of Choksi, Goldberg, John, Itoh, Lele and DeGiorgio in claims above.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NGHI H. LY whose telephone number is (571)272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-8:00pm Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nghi H. Ly

/Nghi H. Ly/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617